



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/894,090	06/28/2001	James Zu-Chia Teng	IBM 2 0007SVL920010011US1	5345
75	90 05/14/2004		EXAM	INER
Michael E. Hudzinski			GODDARD, BRIAN D	
FAY, SHARPE	, FAGAN, MINNICH & I	McKEE, LLP		
Seventh Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1100 Superior A	Avenue		2171	la.
Cleveland, OH 44110-2518			DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·	———A——				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	/				
Advisory Action	09/894,090	TENG ET AL.	/~				
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Brian Goddard	2171					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 29 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) 🛮 they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) \( \times \) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NC	OT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: None.							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-9,11-13 and 15-18</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.							
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	<del></del>						
10. Other:		ma					
	\$	SAFET METJA SUPERVISORY PATEN TECHNOLOGY CEN	T EXAMINER				



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new issues being: That the Delete X-lock attribute is 'logically' associated with an X-lock. In response to applicants' arguments that this is not a new issue, the examiner disagrees for the following reasons: The prior existing claim language, "an exclusive X-lock having its Delete X-lock attribute SET," is not equivalent in scope to the Delete X-lock attribute being 'logically' associated with the exclusive X-lock. The 'its' in this prior existing claim language is quantified by the previously recited association between the exclusive X-lock and Delete X-lock attribute. However, this association is not specified, and could be any type of association imaginable. The possesive word "its" does not definitively and expressly require the 'logical' association of the proposed amendment. It merely requires AN association as currently recited by the claims. Thus, the 'logical' association/coupling of the proposed amendment changes the scope of the claim.